application. Now, with another advisory panel in the works, we face another uphill battle to ensure that decisions are based on science alone, rather than tainted by conflicts of interest.

Like device approval, the FDA approval process for pharmaceuticals no longer reflects public's use of these products. Whereas the FDA approval process is based on clinical trials with small samples and short durations, the drug industry is now geared to treating chronic conditions, such as high cholesterol and arthritis, that affect millions of Americans for decades at a time.

In a rush to get these drugs to market, the FDA relies on preliminary studies with little insight into long-term risk, telling manufacturers they will get conditional approval as long as they conduct post-market studies. The problem is, the FDA has no enforcement authority to mandate these studies. With the drugs on the market and the profits rolling in, the manufacturers have nothing to gain from conducting the post-market studies.

The statistics paint a crystal clear picture. As of September 2003, drug manufacturers agreed to perform 1,338 post-market studies. The FDA has reported, however, that two-thirds of them have not even begun that agreement from September of 2003. All the while, manufacturers can either market these products to physicians or directly to the public, who equate the FDA stamp of approval with safety.

Mr. Speaker, we need to give the FDA the tools to hold drug manufacturers to their agreement to do the post-market studies. If they are fined for non-compliance or barred from direct advertising until the studies are completed, maybe the manufacturers would have an incentive to get moving on these studies.

The FDA's regulatory authority needs some teeth. Creating this Drug Safety Oversight Board takes us in the opposite direction by simply rearranging the deck chairs on a sinking ship. If this is how the FDA intends to get back to business, then business as usual is simply not good enough.

CHINA CONSIDERING IMPOSITION OF ANTI-SECESSION LAW ON TAIWAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MIKE ROGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring an important bit of business to the House floor this evening and to Members of the U.S. House, and that is China's consideration of the anti-secession law that they are about to impose on Taiwan.

The anti-secession law is a slap in the face to the recent progress that has been made across the strait in relations with Taiwan and is a bold move to threaten U.S. interests in the region. Last month, the two sides agreed on the very first nonstop commercial flight between China and Taiwan in more than 50 years. Now China appears to be laying the legal groundwork to legitimize material action against Tai-

China is expected to adopt this proposed anti-secession law within this month. However, as Beijing does not allow its citizens or its media objective involvement in their government, the exact nature and time frame of this legislation is known only by a few within the Communist party leadership as China thought it could seek to approve this law under the radar of international scrutiny.

As the United States begins to voice its concern over China's proposed antisecession law, curiously enough, North Korea announces it has a nuclear weapons program. I do not view these two events as coincidental, given U.S. reliance on China to engage in diplomacy on North Korea's nuclear weapons.

In recent history, there were two impediments to China taking over Taiwan militarily, the legality of the takeover and the technological ability to defeat Taiwan and its allies' defensive capabilities. The anti-secession law covers the first obstacle and China's effort to end the European Union's arms embargo would cover the second. This body has overwhelmingly approved a resolution condemning a lift of the arms embargo, which essentially would amount to a technology transfer.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a serious issue, and Beijing should make no mistake that the United States Congress is paying attention. We are paying attention on the anti-secession law, we are paying attention on their military buildup and modernization, and we are paying attention to their economic growth, built on currency manipulation and the violation of intellectual property rights.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House and this body to stand tall and reach across the ocean and tell the Chinese we will be their friends, but they must be friends and participate in the rules of the rest of the Western world.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to award a Congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2761 of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro

tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Ninth Congress:

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN).

SOCIAL SECURITY AND NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Conaway). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. Jackson-Lee) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to cover three topics this evening with my colleagues and frame them in a way that suggest that we are lacking in our focus on a domestic policy.

So many of us have just returned from our districts and had the opportunity to interface with our constituents. What has to be a driving issue across America is, of course, the preservation, the saving of Social Security. But allow me to take you down memory lane just for a moment because maybe in this debate as we listen to economists, the Congressional Budget Office, the various committees of the House and various spokespersons and the administration about Social Security, we fail to understand its origins.

In 1929 we know that there was a market crash, Wall Street crash. We look at our history books. We know that a number of individuals of great wealth committed suicide. During the course of a very large depression, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who was elected on the concept of restoring our economy, began to think about the whole idea of investment in our domestic policies. The WPA was formed, educational policies were enhanced, opportunities for work were provided, and, yes, Social Security.

At that time, if we look at our statistics, we will find that seniors then were in their forties and fifties and were dying because they were destitute after long years of work. There were no opportunities to be able to protect themselves, provide for their daily needs, and certainly there was no opportunity for children to take care of their parents at that time. The resources were meager. So Social Security became that kind of umbrella, that kind of resource, and it lasted and it was steady through the 1940s, 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. Then President Reagan and Tip O'Neill came together in the early 1980s and found a way to shore up Social Security for another 50 years.

We find ourselves now in 2005 in what I call the "generational divide," an unfortunate approach to dividing America over this umbrella for a rainy day. Let me first of all say that Social Security is what it is. It is in fact a retirement benefit, but it is also a survivor benefit for those who lost their

parents. It allows young people to carry on their lives, and it allows the disabled to live an independent and productive life because of the Social Security benefit.

It is important that this debate be full of a factual content. It is not political. It is not Republican. It is not Democratic. It is really an American debate on how we want to take care of those most needy. What kind of separate umbrella do we provide? Do we eliminate the opportunity for 401(k)? Absolutely not. Private savings account? It is your choice.

Those who are in the generation under 45, under 50 have every right to establish their own private savings account, but it is not a place for Social Security. Social Security stands on its own feet as an investment in those in America, for those who have worked hard and those who may have no other options. And I believe it is important that we maintain Social Security and not break the bank by taking almost a trillion dollars, a trillion dollars to put in a private savings account.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you in our congressional districts, Republicans and Democrats alike are understanding this issue. They know that this is divide and conquer, and they know it is wrong. Social Security deserves to be saved.

I want to speak very quickly about this whole issue of low-performing schools and not educating America's workforce. The Governors over the past couple of days said that they are hesitant on putting No Child Left Behind in high schools because it is a problem. It is not working.

You can have regulations and yet have, if you will, no dollars; and that is what we are finding in Houston, Texas, the announcement of low-performing schools with no solutions. We are working in Houston, Texas, where the community has now come together, parents and others, forming caucuses around the idea of working to help those low-performing schools and give children an opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, regulatory entanglement is not the answer. Leave No Child Behind has left many children behind. We now have to get our hands involved, our hands on, and we have to work together as Americans but also as community people to ensure that our schools are working to educate our young people.

In Houston just a few days ago, we saw a terrible tragedy of a 6-month-old child abused, sexually abused, physically abused, huge bruises all over this child. This is an epidemic. First, I would like to thank the Texas Children's Hospital and Dr. Lyn in particular and all the doctors in the emergency room that now over the past couple of months have allowed this child to leave the hospital and go to a foster home.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to call for hearings here in the United States Congress. The Congressional

Children's Caucus will take up this issue to hold hearings, to hear from people around America of the epidemic of child abuse. If nothing else, an innocent child deserves the right to live a beautiful quality of life. The heinous and horrible people, parents or not, that would abuse a child both sexually and physically should be obviously put in the criminal justice system, and more importantly not be allowed to be able to have that child again.

We must protect our children, and I call for these hearings as well as legislation to stop the epidemic of child abuse.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO-VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 841, CONTINUITY IN REP-RESENTATION ACT OF 2005

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–10) on the resolution (H. Res. 125) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 841) to require States to hold special elections to fill vacancies in the House of Representatives not later than 45 days after the vacancy is announced by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in extraordinary circumstances, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PRO-VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 27, JOB TRAINING IMPROVE-MENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-11) on the resolution (H. Res. 126) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 27) to enhance the workforce investment system of the Nation by strengthening one-stop career centers, providing for more effective governance arrangements, promoting access to a more comprehensive array of employment, training, and related services, establishing a targeted approach to serving youth, and improving performance accountability, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, 109TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House, I submit for printing in the RECORD the Rules of Procedure of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on February 10, 2005.

COMMITTEE RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE 109TH CONGRESS

(Adopted February 10, 2005)

RULE 1—APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES

The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a privileged motion in Committees and subcommittees. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

RULE 2—COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS
REGULAR AND ADDITIONAL MEETINGS

(a)(1) The regular meeting day for the Committee shall be at 10 a.m. on the second Wednesday of each month in such place as the Chairman may designate. However, the Chairman may dispense with a regular Wednesday meeting of the Committee.

(2)(A) The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(B) The Chairman shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular and additional meeting of the Committee at least 24 hours before the time of the meeting, except under circumstances the Chairman determines to be of an emergency nature. Under such circumstances, the Chairman shall make an effort to consult the ranking minority member, or in such member's absence, the next ranking minority party member of the Committee.

WIRELESS TELEPHONE USE PROHIBITED

(b) No person may use a wireless telephone during a Committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing.

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT

(c)(1) The Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by the Committee, and the subcommittee Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by a subcommittee. shall make public announcement of the date. place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee or the subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman or the subcommittee Chairman, as the case may be, shall consult with the ranking minority member and make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Clerk of the Congressional Record and the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the Committee and each of its subcommittees shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of House rule XI.

QUORUM AND ROLLCALLS

(d)(1) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for business and a majority of the members of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum thereof for business, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(2) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.